

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/588,656	Applicant(s) SUGIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner SOPHIE HON	Art Unit 1794	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sophie Hon. (3) Etsuko Ohno.
 (2) Richard Treanor. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 2001/0022997.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Some proposed amendments were discussed in light of the identified prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sophie Hon/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required